

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- x  
AMY GALLINA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

25-cv-4658 (LAK)

TARGET CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.  
----- x

**ORDER**

LEWIS A. KAPLAN, *District Judge*.


Jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1441. The notice of removal fails adequately to allege the existence of subject matter jurisdiction because, perhaps among other things, it fails adequately to allege:

- ☒ The citizenship of one or more natural persons. *See, e.g., Sun Printing & Publishing Ass'n v. Edwards*, 194 U.S. 377 (1904); *Leveraged Leasing Administration Corp. v. PacifiCorp Capital, Inc.*, 87 F.3d 44 (2d Cir. 1996).
- ☐ The citizenship of one or more corporations. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1).
- ☐ The citizenship of one or more partnerships. *See Carden v. Arkoma Assocs.*, 494 U.S. 195 (1990).
- ☒ The ~~exact nature and~~ citizenship of one or more alleged limited liability companies. *See Handlesman v. Bedford Village Green Assocs. L.P.*, 213 F.3d 48, 52 (2d Cir. 2000).

Absent the filing, on or before June 16, 2025 of an amended notice of removal adequately alleging the existence of subject matter jurisdiction, this action will be remanded for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 9, 2025



\_\_\_\_\_  
Lewis A. Kaplan  
United States District Judge